

April 5, 2007 Greater LA County IRWMP Leadership Committee Meeting Notes

Complete Minutes will be prepared by the Leadership Committee, however, the following items seem either timely or of particular interest to NSMBW Steering Committee members from previous discussions.

Proposition 50 Second Round Funding Update – The two points below are uncertain as to whether or not Lester Snow from the Department of Water Resources has actually made a final decision, but there is every indication that the following will occur:

- 1) There is approximately \$64 million remaining in Prop. 50 IRWMP funding. To meet the statutory mandate to spend a minimum of 40% in Southern California, \$52 million will need to go to the So. Cal. applicants.
- 2) No IRWMP Region that received \$25 million in Round 1 Funding Cycle will be eligible to receive Round 2 funding.

Proposition 84 Update- The DWR (who will administer this IRWMP program) expects to draft guidelines by mid-summer and have an RFP out by fall 2007.

- 1) The LA IRWMP Region is one of potentially 3 in Funding Area 11 that by statute will divide \$215 million (minus 8.5% State administrative fee). Whether or not this will require an inter-regional competitive grant process or whether a mutually agreeable funding split can be made between Ventura County IRWMP and Upper Santa Clara River IRWMP and our Region is not yet determined.

Leadership Committee representatives are still holding friendly conversations with the other groups in Funding Area 11 as well as DWR. If the split was made by population alone, LA County IRWMP would receive 92% of \$196,725,000. But that will not be the sole determining factor. LA County staff has prepared a matrix with various factors that should be considered and will add to the list: population, pollution/stressors, acres of lakes, lagoons, miles of rivers/streams, number of cities, miles of coastline, size of disadvantaged communities, open space, ag lands, impaired water sources, water supply needs, etc.

LA County will draft a letter to DWR advocating some or all of these factors be considered when determining a fair allocation of the Prop. 84 \$\$ to our area. The draft letter will first be given to the other two groups for their comments before being sent to DWR.

- 2) A related motion was presented but failed to pass (5-3-3 abstentions) to ask DWR to require that the Upper Santa Clara River Watershed IRWMP Group be forced to join with the Lower River Group in Ventura County because it is one hydrological region. The two groups have not ended their attempt to join the two IRWMPs but have management issues to work out. The reason it is important to LA County IRWMP is that under the current circumstances, they can compete as separate IRWMPs and that is

unfair to LA County IRWMP that needs to carry the economic load for a vastly larger and more complicated area.

3) A request was made to put the Proposition 84 state budget on the May Leadership Committee agenda so that the group can take a position to request that more funding be made available in the 2007/2008 fiscal year.

Greater LA County IRWMP Governance Recommendations – The consultants were tasked with a general review of other multi-agency governance options as well as a specific inventory of LA IRWMP history through interviews with Leadership Committee members and Steering Committee discussions. They presented their recommendations to the LC Committee. A lively discussion ensued with the general theme that the recommendations (without changes) should be sent to the Steering Committees for their comments. The LC did ask the consultants to emphasize that, if Steering Committees do support the 3 appointments from each sub-region recommendation, then SCs should consider having those 3 represent different water strategies so that the final makeup of the Leadership Committee is most likely to cover all water strategies required in the IRWMP program.

Ed Means is to circulate the full 14-page outline to the Steering Committee chairs for redistribution. Steering Committees are to review and provide comments/recommendations for the long-term governance structure using the consultants' outline as a framework for discussion. Additional funding will be given to the consultants to help facilitate this in each sub-region meetings in April. Homework is recommended so that each Steering Committee member is prepared to ask questions and provide recommendations.

The Steering Committees will be asked to empower their Chair to vote on the Governance Structure at the May Leadership Committee meetings. There is a reasonable expectation that a variety of hybrids will evolve from the consultants' recommendation and will be presented to the LC for a vote.

Some LC members stated they would like the opportunity to bring back any hybrids that differed from their Steering Committee recommendations before the Chair could vote. There was some uncertainty as to whether there is a real or perceived urgency for making a final decision on governance but some believe that it may be better to be delay a final vote until the June LC meeting to assure Steering Committee support for any alternative governance structure.

Proposition 50 Round 1 Projects –

- 1) LA County is not prepared to accept the standard DWR grant agreement language because, as written, the entire burden for all 9 projects for compliance and grant matches would be an LA County responsibility. This issue is holding up the project grant agreement. Various entities offered to supply suggested language that has been used in the past for similar

circumstances. Frank Kuo will go to Sacramento to hammer out acceptable terms.

- 2) LA County Flood Control District expects to be reimbursed for the costs of project administration. Each project will be evaluated according to yet-to-be-determined factors with individual project negotiations. A formula is being drafted. No details or guesses provided. Each project will need to adopt an MOU with the County – the language for which is not yet drafted but will be started.

Greater LA County IRWMP Project Priorities –

This will be a key discussion at the April 17 Steering Committee meeting. The 30 projects to be the SC highest priority are not subject to ‘ready-to-go’ or some other issues at this time – Just focus on highest priority projects for each sub-region without consideration of source of funds or time of grant. Then as each grant program comes on line, there will be a reevaluation of projects to consider.

Other sub-regions are having one or two day workshops in order to fully address this task. One is having a 2-day back-to-back. The NSMBW Steering Committee will be meeting on April 16th (the day before the regularly scheduled meeting) to do some homework on this task.

Greater LA County IRWMP Group and MOU

This item will be discussed in-full at the May LC meeting because other Steering Committee members and stakeholders are struggling to find out if or when adopting an MOU with the County is needed. The current MOU only covers Prop. 50 funding issues. If there are no more chances for additional Prop. 50 funding, then there may be no purpose for the MOUs as written. On the other hand, it is possible that new MOUs are required for Prop. 84 funds but the County does not know in what form it may take. Stay tuned....